

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/706,004	Applicant(s) BILOTTI, ALFRED J.	
	Examiner Hargobind S Sawhney	Art Unit 2875	

All Participants:

(1) Hargobind S Sawhney.

(2) Mr. Raymond Sun.

Date of Interview: 29 September 2004

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

12

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.


☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____



 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation Sheet:

On September 29, 2004, the examiner contacted the attorney, Mr. Raymond Sun, to indicate that the limitation " the hollow support", recited in line 2 of Claim 12 , lacks antecedent basis. Further because of the limitation " hollow support", Claim 12 would receive double patenting rejection under 35 U.S.C. 10. In response, Mr. Sun authorized an examiner amendment requiring " the hollow support" be rephrased as --the support--. Copy of the telephone interview is attached herewith.